

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2008

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-2. These sheets, which include Figures 1-2, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-2. In both of the figures, the notation "Prior Art" has been added next to the figure number.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2008

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-30 are pending in the application. The Examiner additionally stated that claims 1-30 are rejected. By this communication, claim 18 is cancelled and claims 1, 4, 7, 10-11, 19-20, 24-26, and 29-30 are amended. Hence, claims 1-17 and 19-30 are pending in the application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing amendments.

In the Drawings

Applicant has amended the drawings to note that FIGURES 1-2 are prior art.

In the Specification

Paragraph [0012] is hereby amended to remove the hyperlink to the NIST website. In addition, Applicant has amended the specification to secure a substantial correspondence between the claims amended herein and the remainder of the specification. No new matter is presented.

In the Claims

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yup et al., US20020191784 (hereinafter, "Yup") in view of Dhir et al., US 20050084076 (hereinafter, "Dhir") and Yu et al., US7,106,860, hereinafter, "Yu"). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

As per claim 1, the Examiner noted that Yup discloses an apparatus for performing cryptographic operations, comprising:

- a cryptographic instruction, received by a computing device as part of an instruction flow executing on said computing device, wherein said cryptographic instruction prescribes one of the cryptographic operations, and wherein said cryptographic instruction prescribes that an intermediate result (*data blocks*) be generated [page 3, paragraph 0039];

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

- and execution logic (*transformation blocks*), operatively coupled to said cryptographic instruction, configured to execute said one of the cryptographic operations, configured to generate said intermediate result [page 3, paragraph 0039].

The Examiner conceded that Yup does not explicitly disclose performing these instructions on a microprocessor based platform nor performing the instruction within a single microprocesor.

Nonetheless, the Examiner opined that Dhir discloses a similar apparatus and further discloses performing cryptographic instructions (i.e., program instructions) to implement the Advanced Encryption Standard algorithm on a microprocessor based platform(i.e., FPGA) [page 5, paragraph 0051].

The Examiner furthermore remarked that Yu discloses a similar apparatus and furthermore discloses performing cryptographic instructions (i.e., *executes several steps of an algorithm*) to implement the Advanced Encryption Standard algorithm on a single microprocessor (i.e., *optimized cipher subprocessor 700*) [column 4, lines 14-30 & figure 7a].

Therefore, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform these instructions on a single microprocessor, a microprocessor based platform, or any other platform in order to meet particular design requirements.

The Examiner noted that in the preceding communication Applicant argued that Yup does not disclose cryptographic instructions. Yet, , the Examiner disagreed and submitted that while: the exact term "cryptographic instructions" is not disclosed, Yup does in fact teach cryptographic instructions (i.e., finite state machine controllers which controls the operation of the remaining portions of the circuit) [page 3, paragraph 0025].

Furthermore, the Examiner pointed out that Applicant argued that Yup does not disclose cryptographic instructions received by a microprocessor. In disagreement, the Examiner submitted that such a point is moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

Moreover, the Examiner noted that Applicant argued that Yup does not disclose execution logic coupled to a cryptographic instruction, configured to generate and intermediate result. But the Examiner disagreed and submitted that Yup does disclose an instruction to generate intermediate results (i.e., under control of a START control signal ... this cycle continues until the data block has been transformed a predetermined number of rounds, thus each round can be viewed as an "intermediate result") [page 4, paragraph 0040].

Additionally, the Examiner stated that Applicant argued that Yup does not disclose a data block coupled to a cryptographic instruction. However, the Examiner disagreed and submitted that Yup does disclose this feature (i.e., finite state machine controllers which controls the operation of the remaining portions of the circuit, such as the data- blocks) [page 3, paragraphs 0025 & 0039].

In reply, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterizations of Yup, Dhir, and Yu vis-à-vis that subject matter which is recited in claim 1. To aid in the following analysis, claim 1, as amended herein, is repeated below.

1. An apparatus for performing cryptographic operations, comprising:

fetch logic, disposed within a microprocessor, configured to receive a single atomic cryptographic instruction as part of an instruction flow executing on said microprocessor, wherein said single atomic cryptographic instruction prescribes one of the cryptographic operations, and wherein said single atomic cryptographic instruction prescribes that an intermediate result be generated;

translation logic, coupled to said fetch logic, configured to translate said single atomic cryptographic instruction into a sequence of micro instructions that directs said microprocessor to perform said one of the cryptographic operations; and

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

execution logic, disposed within said microprocessor and operatively coupled to said single atomic cryptographic instruction, configured to execute said one of the cryptographic operations, and configured to generate said intermediate result, wherein said execution logic comprises:

a cryptography unit, configured execute a plurality of cryptographic rounds on each of one or more input text blocks to generate a corresponding each of one or more output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic rounds are prescribed by a round count field within a control word that is provided to said cryptography unit.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a "single atomic cryptographic instruction" that prescribes the listed operations. This amendment is provided to more clearly distinguish the present invention over the circuits and "processors" taught by Yup and Yu and support for use of the single atomic cryptographic instruction in a program being executed by a microprocessor may be found in paragraphs 43, 45, 48, 52, and 94, *inter alia*, of the instant specification.

Applicant has also amended claim 1 to recite that the execution logic (a logical stage in a microprocessor) comprises a cryptography unit that performed the cryptographic rounds. Numerous paragraphs and figures in the instant disclosure provide support for this amendment and teach that the cryptography unit is one of a plurality of units (e.g., integer unit, floating point unit, MMX unit, SSE unit, etc) in the execution stage of the microprocessor.

Applicant has further amended claim 1 to recite translation logic that translates the single atomic cryptographic instruction into a sequence of micro instructions that directs the microprocessor to perform the one of the cryptographic operations.

In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yup does not teach use of a single atomic cryptographic instruction to prescribe the operations recited in the claim. In fact, Applicant has been careful to search Yup and reports that the term "cryptographic instruction" cannot be found. In reply to the Examiner's point that Yup

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

does in fact teach cryptographic instructions (i.e., finite state machine controllers which controls the operation of the remaining portions of the circuit) [page 3, paragraph 0025], Applicant responds that the instant disclosure clearly teaches the meaning of an "instruction" such that it is quite distinct from a finite state machine controller as is taught by Yup in the cited section. The instant disclosure teaches that an instruction, such as the single atomic cryptographic instruction recited in claim 1, is part of an application program. Clearly, a finite state machine controller is not part of an application program. As one skilled in the art will appreciate, a application program's instructions are fetched from memory for execution by a microprocessor. These features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Yup.

In contrast, Yup teaches "A circuit includes a single circuit portion for implementing the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) block cipher algorithm in a system having a plurality of channels. The circuit portion includes a circuit for individually generating, on the fly, the round keys used during each round of the AES block cipher algorithm. The circuit portion also includes shared logic circuits that implement the transformations used to encrypt and decrypt data blocks according to the AES block cipher. The single circuit portion encrypts or decrypts data blocks from each of the plurality of system channels in turn, in round-robin fashion. The circuit portion also includes a circuit for determining S-box values for the AES block cipher algorithm. The circuit additionally implements an efficient method for generating round keys on the fly for the AES block cipher decryption process. (Abstract)

Without a doubt, Yup teaches a circuit for implementing the AES block cipher algorithm in a system having a plurality of channels. This is somewhat analogous to prior art stand-alone cryptographic processing units, the problems of which the present inventors have noted and for which the present invention is provided to overcome. Yet, Yup is utterly silent with regard to how the invention is commanded to process data blocks other than to present a plurality of input registers 102 and associated control signals 103 that are coupled to a corresponding plurality of "system channels."

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

One skilled will appreciate that this type of configuration is cumbersome in that to provide for encryption and/or decryption of data, a processor must provide for communication with Yup's device via some system channel mechanism.

In stark contrast, claim 1 recites a single atomic cryptographic instruction that is fetched from memory by a microprocessor as part of an instruction flow executing on said microprocessor. The claim continues to recite how the cryptographic instruction prescribes that an intermediate result be generated. The claim further recites that translation logic translates it into a sequence of micro instructions that direct the microprocessor to perform the one of the cryptographic operations. Yup does not teach or suggest an instruction such as is disclosed that provides for the foregoing limitations. The claim also recites execution logic that is within the microprocessor as well and that is operatively coupled to said single atomic cryptographic instruction, configured to execute said one of the cryptographic operations, said execution logic comprising: a key size controller, configured to employ said one of a plurality of cryptographic key sizes during execution of said one of the cryptographic operations. Although Yup teaches a START control signal to start the rounds, as the Examiner suggests, such a signal is not a cryptographic instruction that is fetched from memory as part of an instruction flow, as disclosed in the instant application. Regarding a microprocessor instruction that prescribes a cryptographic operation, Yup is utterly silent.

In addition, claim 1 recites that the cryptographic rounds are performed by a cryptography unit within the execution logic of the microprocessor. Applicant submits that the operations performed by the cryptography unit of the present invention are roughly analogous to those operations performed by the circuit of Yup. However, the performance of cryptographic rounds in the cryptography unit is responsive to prescription of the cryptographic operation by a single atomic cryptographic instruction provided in a program flow for execution by the microprocessor, and Yup utterly fails to teach this aspect of the present invention.

Consequently, in reply to the Examiner's statement that that Dhir discloses a similar apparatus and further discloses performing cryptographic instructions (i.e., program

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

instructions) to implement the Advanced Encryption Standard algorithm on a microprocessor based platform (i.e., FPGA), Applicant wishes to make several points. First, as noted above, claim 1 specifically recites a microprocessor, not a microprocessor based platform. It is furthermore asserted that a microprocessor is clearly disclosed within the instant specification and drawings in such a manner as to be quite distinct from a microprocessor based platform. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art will appreciate that a microprocessor based platform can conceivably comprise, for example, one or more microprocessors, memory, coprocessors, I/O, operator interface, etc, whereas a microprocessor comprises elements such as are disclosed in the instant disclosure, to include fetch logic, translation logic, execution logic, etc. Additionally, while the hardware to perform cryptography is presently known to be disposed as a coprocessor in many typical present day configurations, it is respectfully asserted that there is no implementation of a microprocessor that includes such capability.

Secondly, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Dhir's invention as a microprocessor based platform. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would characterize Dhir's invention as a field programmable gate array (FPGA) is that is coupled to memory having programming instructions for configuring the FPGA with a medium access layer selected from more than one type of medium access layers. [Abstract – an FPGA is not a microprocessor, nor is it a microprocessor based platform.] Applicant further submits that a more correct characterization of Dhir's invention would be a FPGA-based platform.

Applicant has been careful to search Dhir and finds that a microprocessor is only mentioned twice and it is noted that fixed logic circuit 32 may be a microprocessor, which is provided to replace a set of configurable logic blocks 80, a set of memory blocks 90, and/or a set of multipliers 92, as are found in the X4000E family of field programmable gate arrays and/or the Virtex-II field programmable gate arrays. [paragraphs [0033] and [0037]]. Certainly Dhir does not teach, nor does he suggest, a microprocessor as is disclosed in the instant application and which is recited in claim 1. All Dhir teaches is that one may replace fixed logic 32 with a microprocessor. Dhir certainly does not teach a microprocessor that fetches and executes cryptographic

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

instructions as part of an instruction flow (i.e., an application program). Applicant provides an example of a microprocessor in the instant disclosure as an x86-compatible microprocessor. This is obviously not what is taught by either Yup or Dhir, nor can it be derived from a combination of the two references.

Regarding Yu, Applicant has carefully reviewed the teachings therein and respectfully submits that Yu teaches a mechanism for performing AES encryption that is substantially equivalent to the circuit taught by Yup. The Examiner pointed Applicant to FIGURE 7a of Yu to find support for the assertion that Yu teaches performing cryptographic instructions to implement AES on a single microprocessor. Applicant respectfully disagrees and notes that Yu teaches a dedicated cryptographic processor 700 that is coupled to a separate host processor 710 and receives instructions and data to perform AES rounds over 32-bit host busses. The cipher subprocessor employs direct memory access (DMA) techniques to perform transactions to/from the host processor's memory 851 to store/load data and instructions. Applicant notes that such a separate dedicated cryptographic "processor" approach is discussed, along with its commensurate limitations, in paragraphs 19-20, *inter alia*, of the instant specification. (Figures 8, 11, and 12, and column 8, lines 6-15)

Respectfully, Applicant stresses that the approaches of Yup, Dhir, and Yu are techniques employed by hardware *external to a microprocessor*, the disadvantages and limitations of which Applicant notes within the instant application. The apparatus of claim 1, on the other hand, performs cryptographic operations *within a microprocessor, responsive to a single atomic cryptographic instruction fetched from memory*, which is advantageous in one aspect in that an instruction is provided for use by a programmer to instruct the microprocessor to perform one of a plurality of cryptographic operations. In addition, the cryptographic rounds are performed by a cryptography unit that is within the execution logic of the microprocessor, and not by a separate unit that is external to the microprocessor.

Based upon the above arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

With respect to claims 2-17, these claims depend from claim 1 and add further limitations that are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Yup, Dhir, Yu, or a combination of the references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2-17.

By this communication, claim 18 is cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

As per claim 19, the Examiner noted that Yup discloses an apparatus for performing cryptographic operations, comprising:

- a control word, configured to prescribe that an intermediate result(*data blocks*) be generated during execution of one of the cryptographic operations (*noting that transformations are then repeated on the data block that is fed back until a predetermined number of rounds is completed*) [page 4, paragraph 0040-0041]. The examiner noted that it is inherent to employ a current round number if the apparatus is comparing the current round number to a predetermined round number; and
- a cryptography unit (*transformation blocks*) within a device, configured to execute said one of the cryptographic operations responsive to receipt of a cryptographic instruction.

The Examiner stated that Yup does not explicitly disclose performing these instructions on a microprocessor based platform nor performing the instruction within a single microprocessor, but that Dhir discloses a similar apparatus and further discloses performing cryptographic instructions(i.e., program instructions) to implement the Advanced Encryption Standard algorithm on a microprocessor based platform(i.e., FPGA) [page 5, paragraph 0051], and that Yu discloses a similar apparatus and further discloses performing cryptographic instructions to implement AES on a single microprocessor.

The Examiner therefore concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform these instructions on a single microprocessor, a microprocessor based platform, or any other platform in order to meet particular design requirements.

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments provided above and directs attention to the arguments submitted in traversal of the rejection of claim 1. In summary, both Yup's invention and Yu's cipher subprocessor are stand-alone units, not part of a microprocessor. As such, they do not execute an instruction flow. And furthermore, the instruction flow taught by Applicant includes a single atomic cryptographic instruction that prescribes, *inter alia*, that an intermediate result be generated during execution of one of the cryptographic operations. Applicant teaches that the single cryptographic instruction is translated into a sequence of micro instructions that directs the microprocessor to perform the prescribed cryptographic operation. And Applicant's cryptographic rounds are performed by a cryptography unit that is integral to the execution logic of the microprocessor.

In addition, Dhir's invention is a field programmable gate array (FPGA) that is coupled to memory having programming instructions for configuring the FPGA with a medium access layer selected from more than one type of medium access layers. Dhir's FPGA is not a microprocessor, nor does it teach or suggest fetch logic within a microprocessor for fetching a cryptographic instruction from memory.

In view of the above arguments, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 21-24, these claims depend from claim 19 and add further limitations that are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Yup, Dhir, Yu, or a combination of the references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 21-24.

As per claim 25, the Examiner noted that Yup disclose a method for performing cryptographic operations in a device, the method comprising:

- a. via a cryptographic instruction, prescribing that an intermediate result be generated during execution of one of a plurality of cryptographic operations (noting that transformations are then repeated on the data block that is fed back until a predetermined number of rounds is completed) [page 4, paragraphs 0040-0041]; and

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

- receiving the cryptographic instruction, and generating the intermediate result when executing the one of the cryptographic operations (noting transformations are then repeated on the data block that is fed back until a predetermined number of rounds is completed) [page 4, paragraph 0040-0041].

The Examiner noted that Yup does not explicitly disclose performing these instructions on a microprocessor based platform nor performing the instruction within a single microprocessor, but that Dhir discloses a similar method and further discloses performing cryptographic instructions (i.e., program instructions) to implement the Advanced Encryption Standard algorithm on a microprocessor based platform (i.e., FPGA) [page 5, paragraph 0051], and that Yu discloses performing cryptographic instructions to implement the AES algorithm on a single microprocessor.

The Examiner therefore concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform these instructions on a single microprocessor, a microprocessor based platform, or any other platform in order to meet particular design requirements.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the points asserted above and directs the Examiner's attention to the arguments submitted in traversal of the rejections of claims 1 and 19. Claim 25 recites, among other elements and limitations, within a microprocessor, fetching and translating a single atomic cryptographic instruction—not instructions, plural—from memory that prescribes that an intermediate result be generated during execution of one of a plurality of cryptographic operations. As noted earlier, Yup and Yu do not teach a microprocessor, nor it is taught that the microprocessor receives a single atomic cryptographic instruction that prescribes that an intermediate result be generated during execution of one of a plurality of cryptographic operations. This is because Yup and Yu teach a stand-alone AES unit that is fed data from system channels. In addition, Dhir teaches using FPGAs to configure a MAC layer device on a wireless LAN. Neither Yup, Yu, nor Dhir teach or suggest fetching a single atomic cryptographic instruction from memory that prescribes that an intermediate result be generated during execution of one of a plurality of cryptographic operations, and via a cryptography unit disposed

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

within execution logic in the microprocessor, generating the intermediate result when executing the one of the cryptographic operations.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 26-30, these claims depend from claim 25 and add further limitations that are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Yup , Dhir, Yu, or a combination of the two references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 26-28 and 30.

Application No. 10826435 (Docket: CNTR.2075)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 03/07/2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/11/2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2008

CONCLUSIONS

Applicant believes this to be a complete response to all of the issues raised in the instant office action and further submits, in view of the amendments and arguments advanced above, that claims 1-17 and 19-30 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested, and allowance of the claims is solicited.

Applicant also notes that any amendments made by way of this response, and the observations contained herein, are made solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent business Goals (PBG), 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (September 8, 2000), and are furthermore made without prejudice to Applicant under this or any other jurisdictions. It is moreover asserted that insofar as any subject matter might otherwise be regarded as having been abandoned or effectively disclaimed by virtue of amendments made herein and/or incorporated in attachments submitted with this response, Applicants wishes to reserve the right and hereby provides notice of intent to restore such subject matter and/or file a continuation application in respect thereof.

Applicant earnestly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning this amendment, the application, or allowance of any claims thereof.

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8 that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date of signature shown below.

Respectfully submitted,
HUFFMAN PATENT GROUP, LLC

/ Richard K. Huffman/

By: _____

RICHARD K. HUFFMAN, P.E.
Registration No. 41,082
Tel: (719) 575-9998

03 / 07 / 2008

Date: _____

Attachment